IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

TAMARA M. DERVIN, on behalf of)	
herself and all other similarly situated,)	
•)	Case No. 1:21-cv-04215
Plaintiff,)	
)	
V.)	Hon. Charles P. Kocoras
)	
NBTY, INC., a Delaware corporation,)	
and NATURE'S BOUNTY, INC., a)	
Delaware corporation,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS' NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY

In their supplemental submission (Dkt. 43), citing *Ferrari v. Vitamin Shoppe Indus.*, 2023 WL 3911507 (1st Cir.) ("*Vitamin Shoppe*"), Defendants contend that Plaintiff base's her opposition to Defendants' motion to dismiss on the ground that the decision in *Greenberg v. Target*, 985 F. 3d 650 (9th Cir. 2021) was wrongly decided.

Greenberg and Vitamin Shoppe, both summary judgment decisions by out-of-circuit courts, were predicated on their belief that the plaintiffs in each case had admitted that the vitamin in question provided the represented benefits when consumed in its natural form. Yet, this is not the case here as the Amended Complaint at ¶¶ 54-96 (Dkt. 43) sets forth cogent and detailed factual allegations as to why, as a matter of scientific fact, biotin in its natural form found in foods does not and cannot help support hair skin and nails.

Moreover, two wrongs do not make a right, and for the reasons set forth in Plaintiff's response to Defendants' motion to dismiss the holdings in these two cases turn the purposes of the

FDA's dietary supplement law on its head- allowing supplement manufacturers to market and sell

vitamins in supplement form that as a matter of well-settled science do not work as represented.

Furthermore, the Seventh Circuit has made clear that when labeling imparts two different

meanings to the reasonable consumer, and one is deceptive, a valid consumer fraud claim has been

stated. Viewing Greenberg and Vitamin Shoppe in their most favorable light even if one accepts

the Courts' findings that the plaintiffs admitted that the vitamin in question provided the

represented benefits when found in its natural form found in food (Greenberg) or in a different

dose (Vitamin Shoppe), implicit in these holdings is that the labeling in question conveyed two

different meanings. For example, assuming that the Plaintiff in Greenberg admitted that biotin in

its natural form helped support hair skin and nails at a minimum, there were two different messages

being conveyed in the labeling (1) that biotin in its natural form found in foods helped support hair

skin and nails and (2) that the Defendant's supplemental biotin provided the same benefits.

Here, there can be no doubt that Plaintiff has more than plausibly alleged that the

supplemental form of biotin sold by Defendants here does not and cannot provide the represented

benefits. Thus, under Bell v. Publix Super Markets, Inc., 982 F.3d 468, 478 (7th Cir. 2020) where

a labeling statement is capable of two interpretations and one of these statements is deceptive a

valid consumer fraud claim has been alleged.

For these reasons, Plaintiff respectfully requests the Court to deny Defendants' motion to

dismiss and allow this matter to proceed to discovery.

Dated: June 14, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

s/ Stewart M. Weltman

HART MCLAUGHLIN & ELDRIDGE, LLC One South Dearborn Street, Suite 1400

Chicago, Illinois 60603

¹ Cited by Plaintiff as supplemental authority here. Dkt. 42.

2

sweltman@hmelegal.com

t: (312) 955-0545

LEVIN SEDRAN & BERMAN LLP Charles Schaffer 510 Walnut St., Ste. 500 Philadelphia, PA 19106 cschaffer@lfsblaw.com t: (215)592-1500

CUNEO GILBERT & LADUCA, LLP Charles LaDuca 4725 Wisconsin Ave., NW, Ste. 200 Washington, D.C. 20016 charles@cuneolaw.com t: (202)789-3960

AUDET & PARTNERS LLP Michael McShane 711 Van Ness Ave., Ste. 500 San Francisco, CA 94102 mmcshane@audetlaw.com t: (415)568-2555

VAZIRI LAW LLC Pasha Vaziri 111 W. Washington St., Ste. 1500 Chicago, IL 60602 pvaziri@vaziri.law t: (312)690-2610